

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 RAYMOND L. SMITH,

11 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S 05-0566 LKK CMK

12
13 vs.

14 GUST KEPROES, et al.,

15 Defendants.

ORDER

16
17 _____/
18 Plaintiff, who is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, brings this civil rights
19 action. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
20 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 72-302(b)(21).

21 On November 3, 2005, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations
22 herein, which were served on plaintiff and which contained notice to plaintiff that any objections
23 to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days. Plaintiff has filed
24 objections to the findings and recommendations; the undersigned has considered the objections
25 and has determined there is no need to modify the findings and recommendations based on the
26 points raised in the objections.

1 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-
2 304, this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire
3 file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by
4 proper analysis.

5
6 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

7 1. The findings and recommendations filed November 3, 2005, are adopted in
8 full;

9 2. The motion to dismiss filed by defendant Jean Wright d/b/a Cove Mobile Villa
10 be granted and plaintiff's claims against defendant Jean Wright d/b/a Cove Mobile Villa sued
11 herein as Jean Wright and Cove Mobile Villa be dismissed with prejudice;

12 3. Plaintiff's claims against Gust Keproes, Bruce Hull, William Warner¹, Kenneth
13 Bottoms, Paul Woodcock and John Does 1-3 be dismissed with prejudice; and

14 4. Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunctive relief be denied.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 DATED: January 11, 2006.

17 /s/Lawrence K. Karlton
18 LAWRENCE K. KARLTON
19 SENIOR JUDGE
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
21
22
23
24

25 ¹ Due to clerical error, the defendant was listed in the magistrate judge's findings and
26 recommendations as William Garner, the correct name is William Warner and is corrected
herein.